LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

COAL, OIL AND BRITAIN
The Editor

★

WHO CONTROLS WHOM?
Alan Brown

★

MODERN AGRICULTURE UNDER SOCIALISM
Jurgen Kuczynski

★

Kinross Election Petition : Soviet Profits
Automation and the Office Worker

FEBRUARY 1965

Two Shillings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. 47 No. 2 FEBRUARY . 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
Notes of the Month: Coal, Oil and Britain. *Intentions and Deeds —Socialist and Capitalist Growth Rates—Why the Difference?—Coal—Oil and Colonialism—Oil Monopolies—Oil and the Balance of Payments—Price for Britain—Self-Strangulation—'East of Suez'—A Single Fight*.....**R.P.D.**	49
Who Controls Whom? The power of capital must be curbed **Alan Brown**	61
The Kinross Election Petition. A lawyer's view of the case of the B.B.C. and McDiarmid.....**A Legal Correspondent**	65
Profits and the Soviet Union. Planning and Profit—an answer to Sovietologists.....**Andrew Rothstein**	69
Modern Agriculture Under Socialism. Constructive thinking on economic development of newly-liberated countries with Cuba as an example.....**Professor J. Kuczynski**	74
Automation and the Office Worker. Advancing automation brings common problems to manual and non-manual workers **B. G. Stacey**	78
Shall Nazi Criminals Go Free? West German legal scandal exposed.....**D. N. Pritt, Q.C.**	82
Anthropologists Meet in Moscow. Unesco conference concerned to expose 'scientific racists'.....**R. Frankenberg**	84
Citrine and the T.U.C. A contemporary's view of Citrine when he dominated the T.U.C.....**Arthur Horner**	88
Illustration: The February Strike.	72-73
Book Reviews: 'Corridors of Power', C. P. Snow: *Peter Zinkin;* 'Film World', Ivor Montagu: *George Elvin;* 'Some Essential Features of Nkrumahism', The Spark: *Pat Sloan;* 'In the Beginning Was Fear', N. M. Seedo: *Sid Douglas*.	92
Put 'LM' to Work!.....**Helen Falber**	96

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

COAL, OIL AND BRITAIN

These fleets and this military armament are not maintained exclusively or even mainly for the benefit of the United Kingdom or even of the defence of home interests. They are still maintained by a necessity of Empire.

JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, Confidential Report of a Conference at the Colonial Office in June and July, 1897 (short report in Cmd.8956 of 1897), quoted in J. L. Garvin, *Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, Vol. III, pp. 187-8.

January 18, 1965

All the problems at once are beating against the heads of the unhappy Labour Government. The TSR 2 controversy has laid bare, not merely the military dilemma on which the Defence White Paper on February 16 is due to offer its answer to add to the long litter of rejected answers of previous 'Defence' White Papers, but wider questions of the whole future of the aircraft industry, technological development and employment. The miners are engaged in battle to save their industry, employment and community life from destruction; and even the previously promised minimum of 200 million tons production has not so far been reaffirmed by the Government. The railwaymen are similarly battling to save the railways from destruction, at the same time as the unplanned output of the temporarily booming car and lorry industry chokes the roads. Rising prices are met so far with the feather duster of a polite letter of enquiry; while the new gospel of the necessity of higher rents is proclaimed by Ministers, and mortgage interest rates are brought up to the record highest level yet. In the midst of this insolvent home situation 50,000 troops, together with scores of warships and a contingent of V bombers, are dispatched to South East Asia. Appeals are sounded to the civilian population for 'the Dunkirk spirit' to make the necessary sacrifices and efforts. Such is the picture of Britain after the first Hundred Days. Each section of the people protests where the shoe pinches: the aircraft workers marching in the streets of London; the miners; the tenants over higher rents; the housewives over higher prices; the teachers over neglect of school needs; while still maintaining faith in the Government as their Government in contrast to the discredited Tories. But the connecting link of all these various sectors of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

front is not yet seen. That link is colonialism—still the decisive factor of British monopoly capitalism. The understanding of this is the key to the present economic and political situation of Britain, and to the consequent problems of policy of the labour movement and the Labour Government.

A Poster for the Editor

A kindly Government has sent to the private address of the Editor a poster copy of the notorious Government, employers' and T.U.C. 'Joint Statement of Intent on Production, Prices and Incomes', suitable, as the accompanying courteous letter explains, 'for display', no doubt on the walls of his living room, and offering any number of further copies of the poster, presumably to distribute among his friends for similar display. It is difficult to say who, if anyone, whether employer or employed, or even trade union official or civil servant, is taken in by this 'Statement of Intent'. 'One often sees good intentions', remarked shrewd old Montaigne in one of his essays several centuries ago, 'bring about very vicious results'. Certainly there is no lack of flowery language of the most benevolent promises, while the 'vicious results' have initially made themselves felt in the engineering three-year package deal, which ties three million engineering workers to abstain from further demands during the next three years and content themselves with derisory increases, so far as national scales are concerned, such as may well fall below the rise in the cost of living (any rise in the cost of living below 5 per cent in each given year is apparently to be ignored, and even the 5 per cent or over increase has to last three months to be considered). However, Mr. Cousins' own Transport and General Workers' Executive has wisely in its resolution on the Statement refrained from endorsing it, while reaffirming its opposition to wage restraint:

> The Executive does not feel called upon at this stage to express a view regarding the development of the policy statement. At the same time, we reaffirm our complete opposition to wage restraint.

It may not prove so easy in practice to sell the trade unions a pup.

Intentions and Deeds

The pavement of the road to hell is familiar to every child. No discordant note is allowed to mar the honeyed phrases of the Statement. Wage freeze? Never; after the painful outcome of the attempt of the last Labour Government to impose a wage freeze, the burned Mr. Wilson and Mr. Brown fear the fire. Wage restraint? Not a hint

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of it. All the talk today is of the 'planned growth' of wages and all forms of income; 'the largest possible sustained expansion of production and real incomes'; 'increases in wages, salaries and other form of incomes' to develop 'in line with' the increase of the 'real national product'. Thus with a planned growth of 4 per cent in national production in a year, the guiding light for wage increases would be $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent; and of course, as the electoral propaganda insisted, much more than a 4 per cent growth can be achieved by really dynamic and purposeful planning. But supposing the index of total national production fails to show this increase, not through any lack of effort of the workers, but through the direct effect of the policies of the Government and the employers, credit restrictions, rising prices, additional tax burdens on production and increased unemployment. What then?

Illusions and Reality

The 4 per cent aim for 1964 was not fulfilled. The estimate for 1965 is now set by the most optimistic calculators at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent (many put it lower). So the guiding light might sink to $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent or less. Or if zero, zero. Meanwhile prices and profits might be soaring, for they will only be 'reviewed' after the event, while the limitation on wages is immediately operative. Within this diminishing fragment what happens to the recognised 'priority' claims of low paid workers, or women workers, or those whose inadequate remuneration is leading to dangerous shortage, as with nurses and teachers, or alternatively to workers in temporarily booming industries who see themselves piling up increased production and profits for the bosses, while expected to refrain from using the strength of their position to win parallel increases for themselves? What if the proposed 'review' of prices or 'watch' on prices fails, as it is in fact failing, to check the real increase in the cost of living, consequent not merely on the actions of the monopolists, but on Government policies, crippling military expenditure, wars in South East Asia and the like, so that the 'planned growth' of wages becomes in reality a fall in real wages? To all these questions no clear answer is offered. As Mr. Woodcock said, when confronted with these and similar questions in a B.B.C. interview on the evening of the ceremony of the signature of the Statement on December 16, 1964: 'I would not like to speculate exactly what it means'. But in fact the meaning is not so obscure. The meaning is wage restraint.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Growthmanship'

All the current fashionable post-Keynesian economic jargon of the apologists of capitalism, eagerly lapped up and repeated by the Labour theorists and spokesmen, is to see the central question of the economy in terms of 'growth rates'. Keynes sought to offer his solution for the contradictions of cyclical crises and mass unemployment during the inter-war years by his formulas for low interest rates and cheap credit through the State priming the pump. This was the early gospel of the 1945 Labour Government in the initial Dalton era before Cripps. The price of these patent medicines for the sickness of capitalism has meant, as subsequent experience has abundantly shown, a continuous creeping inflation, which has brought new problems, so that the contradictions today are taking on new and sharper forms in the present stage of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. Hence the tone has changed, and the gospel of Keynes has fallen into some discredit among the current economists of capitalism. All emphasis is now turned on 'growth rates'; every element in the economy and every government measure must be geared to achieve high 'growth rates'. The path to this goal is seen as lying through technology, modernisation, automation, planning and a dynamic purposeful impetus from an up-to-date government. Such was the theme song with which Harold Wilson charmed the pre-election Trades Union Congress and the electorate. Real events since then have turned out somewhat differently from the prospectus. Everything had been taken into account in these utopian dreams—except the realities of monopoly capitalism.

Socialist and Capitalist Growth Rates

The reason why this feverish concentration on annual growth rates has developed during the past decade, since the middle fifties, as the main pre-occupation of the economists and political leaders of capitalism is not far to seek. Before the second world war capitalist economic superiority over socialism was taken for granted; the eternal laws of economics were assumed to be the laws of capitalism. After the war, when the strength of Soviet society in face of that unparalleled ordeal had to be recognised, Western nuclear superiority was assumed until by the mid-fifties that illusion also was smashed. So has developed the modern period—which has been described as the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism—the period of the co-existence of two world economic systems, with the new economic system already covering two-fifths of world industries

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

production, rapidly overtaking the old and drawing ever closer within view of outstripping it in a relatively short space of time. From this moment all attention is fixed on annual growth rates, as if they were League match tables. Just as the conception of 'planning', but deprived of its social content, was picked up and copied by capitalism a generation late from socialism, so the attention to annual growth rates has now been similarly imitated.

Why the Difference?

The increasingly inescapable statistical contrast is compelling this anxious concern in the Western world. Between 1937 and 1962 industrial output in the socialist countries increased by 650 per cent, and in the capitalist countries by 169 per cent. If we take the period of the 'German economic miracle' and loudly proclaimed success of the Common Market, between 1950 and 1963 the United Nations statistics show the Soviet Union and socialist countries of Eastern Europe increasing by 300 per cent, with the rest of Europe, excluding the socialist countries, increasing by 108 per cent, or the Common Market Six by 150 per cent. Between 1918 and 1962 the average annual increase of industrial output in the Soviet Union was 10·1 per cent and in the United States 3·4 per cent. Yet during these years the Soviet Union suffered the overwhelming losses and destruction of the war of intervention and the second world war, while the United States suffered no war damage, but was assisted by the war to pile up profits and extend productive capacity. The objection is often voiced that the low initial level inherited by the Soviet Union from Tsarism and the first world war invalidates any percentage comparison over the whole period. The current favourite apologetic theory now argues that, once a high technical level has been reached, the rate of growth inevitably tapers downwards. Very well. Let us take the past decade since 1954, that is, after the Soviet Union had already reached a very high technical level, on the world scale second only to the United States. Between 1954 and 1963 the average annual growth rate of Soviet industrial output was 10·5 per cent, and of American 3·1 per cent. In 1953 Soviet industrial production was 33 per cent of the U.S. level; by 1963 it was 65 per cent. Whichever way the measurements are taken, the contrast between the two lines of development is unmistakable, no less than the future world prospect to which this contrast points. But the contrast is not the contrast of rival setting of targets and plans and growth rates. The contrast is the contrast of two social systems. The Labour spokes-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men in the election (as indeed the Tory Government before them) tried to set *abstractly* targets of annual growth rates without considering the social conditions, and assuming the continuance of the contradictions of monopoly capitalism, including its imperialist commitments. Hence the harsh blows of reality shattering the imaginary abstract targets, after they have come into office. This is the manifest lesson of the Hundred Days.

Coal

The proclaimed object is to increase national production and exports. Let us accordingly shift our attention from abstract generalised targets of the growth rate of the 'gross national product' (which is in many respects a highly dubious and even spurious conception, since it includes unproductive parasitism based on imperialist superprofits as supposedly swelling the 'national product'), and turn to concrete production. Let us consider coal. Coal is Britain's principal home resource. The primacy of Britain as the world's main industrial power was built, in respect of home production, on a basis of coal and the exploitation of the coalminers. The annual production of coal swelled until it reached a total of 287 million tons in 1913. It has never reached that total again. By 1929 the figure was down to 258 million tons, and by 1938 to 227 million. After nationalisation and reorganisation, with extending new mechanical equipment and productive power, the expansion plans of the mid-fifties were based on reaching an eventual output of 240 million tons. By the sixties the target had been reduced to 200 million tons. Last year the industry sold 193 million tons. The recent exchanges between Lord Robens and the Minister of Power, Mr. Lee, have indicated that the Government is reluctant to reaffirm even the aim of 200 million tons. Pits with still unexhausted reserves are closed down as 'uneconomic', while a burden of £1,000 million capital debt, requiring interest charges of £50 million, is throttling the industry ('the board is over-capitalised to a ridiculous extent', *The Times*, January 13, 1965). The miners are leaving the industry. 16,000 left last year. These are the younger miners that are leaving, so that the labour force is aging. They see no future in the industry. Such is the care bestowed by a Government, which is never weary of sounding verbal exhortations for increased production, on Britain's main natural resource and the skilled workers whose lives have been associated with its production for generations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Technological' Alibis

Why? Glibly the answer is offered. Of course it is inevitable technological change. Coal is out of date. The future is with oil and natural gas to be imported. Let the coal industry go down. It is hard on the miners; but this is the price of progress. We cannot allow sentiment to prevail over economic efficiency. It will, however, be wise to examine the true facts a little more closely before accepting this glib 'explanation'. It is not inevitable that the development of new sources of power, whether oil, natural gas or presently nuclear power, should at the present stage, when every source of power is needed, involve the cutting down of production of coal. It is only necessary to observe what happens in socialist economy to see the truth of this. In the Soviet Union the level of coal production of 29 million tons reached by Tsarist Russia in 1913 had increased to 261 million tons by 1950. In that year oil production was 38 million tons. By 1964 oil production had shot up to 223 million tons. Does that mean that the coal target is correspondingly lowered, since oil represents the most 'modern' 'up-to-date' source of power (until the effective development of nuclear power)? On the contrary. In 1964 coal output has simultaneously shot up to 551 million tons. One-tenth the British level in 1913 has become nearly three times the British level in 1964. All sources of power are developed and increased simultaneously in a co-ordinated fashion in a socialist economy which is genuinely concerned to increase production. One source of power is not the enemy of the other. And this, let it be noted, in a country which has its own oil resources, and where in consequence the argument does not arise of import costs as a negative factor in switching to heavy dependence on oil.

Oil and Colonialism

Why, then, is the situation in Britain different? Why is the coal industry and the railway system, which were the basis of Britain's industrial strength, allowed to go down, while the inadequate roads are choked with oil-borne traffic, and the docks, which were constructed and equipped to be served by the rail network reaching them, cannot now cope with the congestion of oil-borne lorries waiting to unload? The answer is not 'technical progress'. The answer is—colonialism. Oil is 'more economic', not primarily on a basis of a true calculation of relative economic costs, but because it is mainly obtained as the principal form of the loot of colonial exploitation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Oil Monopolies

The two biggest monopolies of British monopoly capitalism are the two oil giants—Royal Dutch Shell and British Petroleum. Here we come close to the governing current of modern British economics and politics, whether the Government of the moment be a Tory or a Labour Government. The capital value of the ordinary shares of these two giants in 1962 was £1,912 million. The *Financial Times* of June 23, 1964, in giving this return was examining the total capital value of the shares of the ten biggest British monopolies, reaching an aggregate of £5,432 million. Thus the two oil giants represented 35 per cent of the total capital of the ten biggest British monopolies. If to these two are added the other two giants, Imperial Chemicals and Unilevers, heavily based on overseas colonialist exploitation, the overwhelmingly colonialist-imperialist basis of modern British capitalism (*after* the 'end of empire', dear Mr. Barratt Brown, Miss Rita Hinden, and other refuters of Lenin, please note) is powerfully demonstrated. The market value of the shares of these two oil giants was returned at £3,255 million in 1962 (*Investors' Chronicle*, May 23, 1962). The value of the assets of these two oil giants was returned by the American business magazine *Fortune* in 1964 as $13,975 million or £4,925 million. This return was part of an examination of the fifteen biggest monopolies outside the United States. The two British oil giants topped the list. In the general nostalgic threnodies over the loss of British manufacturing and trading supremacy the real contemporary basis of modern British capitalism and its continuing sphere of predominance is kept carefully out of sight. Recently, in examining the dominantly colonialist basis of British economy, we analysed the table of profits of the twenty biggest British monopolies, compiled from the *Financial Times* in 1963. Once again the two at the head of the list were the two oil giants; and their profits amounted to 37 per cent of the total profits of the twenty biggest British monopolies.

Profits of Colonialist Exploitation

The significance of this oil-based, that is, colonialist dominance in the character of contemporary British monopoly capitalism is far-reaching, equally for British foreign policy and strategy, for the balance of payments, and for the internal economic balance and development or lack of development. Nothing is more sedulously concealed, confused or tucked away under misleading headings than the rôle of colonialist oil exploitation in the British economic struc-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture. In the *U.K. Balance of Payments* annual return the total given for 'interests, profits and dividends' from overseas investment specifically excludes oil from the categories of either 'direct investment' or 'portfolio investment', and buries it under a special category of 'Other', which turns out to be larger than the first two put together. To disentangle the profits of colonialist exploitation in the aggregate profits of the oil giants is no easy task. It is not a question, as is sometimes mistakenly stated, of the competitive rôle of oil arising from cheapness through colonial low wages; for the world price is based on American oil production and applied to Middle Eastern Oil, so that the lower colonial conditions of production only mean larger profits, not cheaper oil. On the other hand, the profits of the joint companies sharing with the Middle Eastern governments usually now on a fifty-fifty basis are only a part, and the lesser part of the picture; since all the most profitable processes of refining, transport and marketing are kept outside the scope of these companies in the hands of the Western oil monopolies. The aggregate profits of the British oil monopolies, with their headquarters in London, will thus appear as profits earned by British companies in Britain; although these profits mainly reflect colonialist exploitation, in addition to the exploitation of the British workers employed by these companies in Britain.

Oil and the Balance of Payments

The Times, in an elaborate and painstaking survey entitled 'Oil Companies' Part in Balance of Payments', by a 'Special Correspondent' on December 15 and 16, 1964, endeavoured to struggle with the problem of estimating the net return obtained by Britain through the oil monopolies. The often very large sums for new investment, as in the case of the Montecatini deal last year of £60 million, treated officially as a debit for the balance of payments, are in reality, this survey points out, usually covered by overseas assets, earnings, operations, or borrowings (basically the normal process of accumulation of a big monopoly through re-investment of a proportion of profits), involving no drain on the British balance of payments. On the other hand, the full total of the credit balance is recognised as not easy to estimate. Even in respect of visible trade the true advantage is partially hidden because 'the price at which imports of crude oil are valued in the official trade returns is for various reasons artificially high, and gives little guide to the true foreign exchange cost of the oil they import'. But 'it is the invisible earnings and outgoings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on current account which create the real problem'. After a series of complicated calculations on this 'obscure but highly important question' the conclusion is reached that 'the net contribution of the two companies' (Shell and British Petroleum) to the British balance of payments in 1963 was 'a total of more than £220 million':

> Without this contribution the net deficit on capital and current account of the whole of the United Kingdom in 1963 (£42 million) would have increased to £262 million.

Let us assume this figure as a careful estimate. In 1963 the net cost of oil imports (petroleum and petroleum products'), after deducting exports, was returned in the trading accounts as £445 million. Let it be recalled that, as pointed out by *The Times* above, the pricing in this figure is 'artificially high'. But even if we accept both these figures as accurate, it means that half the cost of Britain's oil imports are covered by the overseas 'invisible earnings' of the oil monopolies. No wonder that on this basis oil is found 'more economic' than home production.

Price for Britain

The consequences of this for Britain, for the distortion of the whole British economy and defeat of every increased production drive are manifest. Lenin long ago showed how imperialism carries the most harmful economic and social consequences also for the imperialist exploiting country as well as for the oppressed exploited countries, through the extension of parasitism in the metropolitan country and retardation of productive economic development. He illustrated this especially by the example of Britain and its loss of its former industrial supremacy already by the latter part of the nineteenth century. The present situation of Britain demonstrates an even more extreme stage in this process. Because oil can be obtained more advantageously on a basis of colonialist plunder, home production and the utilisation of home resources can be allowed to go down. Let the coal industry go to hell. Run everything on oil. Let the most complete network of railway lines covering the whole country, previously constructed at such expense (and with typical capitalist waste) as the pride of modernisation, capable of carrying all longer distance freight with much greater efficiency and speed than by lorries, be left two-thirds unused, or over whole areas abandoned to become a jungle of weeds. Choke the roads, never built for this purpose, to suffocation with oil-borne traffic, until the problem of traffic congestion becomes the new nightmare.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Self-Strangulation

In place of real modernisation of the railways by electrification, for which the coal resources of the country could be used, fall behind the level of other developed industrial countries in rail electrification, and concentrate on diesels—oil again. The research which has been conducted with such attention to prove cigarettes the cause of lung cancer has never been extended with the same scale and resources to study the effect of diesel fumes—oil again. While the basic industries of coal and the railways go downwards, while the level of steel development falls increasingly behind advanced industrial countries, while electricity generation is inadequate, the car industry booms—oil again. Substitute 'colonialism' for 'oil', and the sickness of the existing British economy is inescapable. While sermonising exhortations are delivered on the necessity to increase production and exports, the characteristic structure of the British monopoly capitalist economy, not merely the universal inherent limitations and contradictions of all monopolist stranglehold on the economy, but the special features of the predominantly colonialist basis of the British monopoly capitalist economy, frustrate the development of home production.

'East of Suez'

The full price is even heavier. Why does Wilson constantly insist on Britain's 'world rôle' to exercise armed power 'East of Suez'? Why are 50,000 troops, with naval contingents, and V bombers, and a steady flow of reinforcements concentrated on Malaysia? Why does Greenwood go to South Arabia to proclaim that Britain will continue to hold the Aden base? Why should British Labour be committed to support the infamous American war in South Vietnam and Laos, where 22,000 American troops are already engaged? 'East of Suez' is the euphemism for the main region of British colonialist, predominantly oil interests. The operations of the British oil monopolies are concentrated on the Middle East and South East Asia, at the same time as they are working in conjunction with American (Shell shareholding in Conch) and French interests to get their hold on Sahara oil and natural gas, with the construction of the pipeline to Britain, and are preparing to open up Eastern Nigeria. The reactionary policies reflecting colonialist interests extend further. Just as the Tories removed Prime Minister Jagan in Guiana by orders from London in 1963, so now, after Jagan and the People's Progres-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sive Party have come through each successive election with a higher proportion of the poll, and in this recent election, not only with an increased proportion of the poll, while Burnham's proportion decreased, but with a higher proportion than placed Labour in power in Britain, Jagan is removed once again by a special Order in Council from London—this time from a Labour Government. The British base of Ascension Island is provided for the U.S. planes and Belgian paras to conduct their armed invasion and aggression against the national liberation movement of the Congo. The cost of the armaments for all these purposes, which have nothing in common with the defence of Britain, bedevil every economic and financial problem of Britain's situation. The Suez War dealt its blow to Toryism in the fifties. Let us be on guard that Malaysia does not become Labour's Suez in the sixties.

A Single Fight

It is necessary to end the separation of the problems of the economic situation at home and of foreign and strategic policy as if they existed in separate compartments. The march of the aircraft workers in London on January 14 sufficiently showed how indissolubly united these questions are. That demonstration, as its spokesmen repeatedly made plain, was not for the sake of saving a nuclear bomber but to save the aircraft industry and to ensure the preparation of the transition to extended civilian production in place of redundancy. The *Daily Telegraph* editorial on January 14 could offer the barbarous sentiment, as an argument for the necessity of maintaining the production of the nuclear bomber:

> Defence research irrigates all research; abolish it, and all research suffers or dies.

If this were true, if war and armaments were the only means to promote science and research, then it would be obvious hypocrisy for the devotees of this 'civilised' outlook to profess to advocate even in principle or as a pious wish the aim of disarmament, since by their definition this would be equivalent to advocating the end of science and research. On the contrary, it is an elementary necessity for the future to enter on a different path—the kind of path which all Bernal's work has indicated. This applies especially to Britain. For the colonialist basis of Britain's economy will not last; and the transition to an alternative basis is urgent. It is necessary to break with the re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actionary and militarist policies which are strangling Britain a.. frustrating the fulfilment of the reforms desired by the people at the election; and to advance, in unity with an independent foreign policy for peace, to develop the resources and science and research and skill of the British people for the reconstruction of Britain.

R.P.D.

WHO CONTROLS WHOM?

Alan Brown

WHO controls whom in Britain? This is a vital question which the first few months of the first Labour Government for thirteen years has thrown to the centre of British politics. Since October 15, the ability of both internal and external forces to influence and control Government policy has become a major issue. Large avenues of power, hitherto often veiled from general view, have been exposed to the light of day. The question as to whether they will be controlled, or will continue to exercise control over events, is crucial to the people—and to the future of the Labour Government itself.

It has been a characteristic of the election and post-election period that a number of real issues, bearing on the welfare of the British people, have become the subject of general public debate. They include the need for cuts in overseas military expenditure, in view of the ever-present balance of payments crises; the need for similar heavy cuts in home arms spending, in order to release more public spending for economic and social purposes; and the need to ensure that a British Government has at least the power to reflect the wishes of the mass of the people on such issues as expenditure on social benefits without outside influence.

These and similar issues arose when they did (and not, for example, in 1961 when the British economy was at another of its low ebbs) because a new government had come to power, pledged to certain new policies and pledged specifically to avoid the deflationary 'stop-go' policies of the past decade and to reverse certain Tory policies. Early Labour measures and proposals—such as the social security benefits increases, the repeal of the 1957 Rent Act, the halt to office building in and around London, and the Corporation and Capital Gains taxes—caused concern to a number of powerful interests as to the tendency of the new Government. These included interests both inside and outside Britain—powerful groupings who

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were themselves involved in the operation to 'save the pound' and rescue the tottering position of London as a financial centre.

From their reaction it was obvious that pressure was being applied to a British government in a more blatant way than for many years. The phrase 'The Gnomes of Zurich' was born, and the spotlight was turned on to the fact that financial interests particularly on the Continent of Europe were demanding, among other things, that the Government should resist its own back-bench pressure and popular opinion, both of which were in favour of bringing forward the pensions increases for Britain's six million old-age-pensioners. Camouflaged as it was beneath a smoke-screen of talk about 'confidence' abroad, the point got home that if foreign bankers, and the forces lying behind them, were opening their coffers they demanded the right to a say in the policies a Labour Government would follow. The situation was summed up by the *Evening Standard* in the headline to a leading article (November 25, 1964): 'Gnomes in Charge'.

The City of London also applied its pressures. Money sped abroad, and more was earmarked to follow it; share prices dipped; banking and business interests made known their concern for their future profit-making. A 2 per cent increase in Bank Rate followed, raising it to the crisis level of 7 per cent; soothing noises were made about the innocuous character of the proposed Corporation and Capital Gains taxes; Building Society interest rate increases were declared inevitable, and many local councils halted lending altogether.

As with recent policies, so with future ones. To the extent that the Labour Government responds to the wishes of the people, of the Labour movement and its left-wing back-benchers, for progressive legislation and action, so to that extent it must circumscribe and limit the power of capital. The ultimate issue is: where is power to lie—with the people or the employers, landlords and financiers?

For thirteen years the Tories spent much of their time in power breaking down wartime and post-war controls on capital, rent and interest. Rent de-control was taken back to a position where fewer houses were controlled than at any time since 1914. Building controls were lifted, and land decontrol was pushed very far. Fetters on the international flow of capital were removed, so that wealth created here was allowed abroad for investment wherever its owners considered best from the interest-earning point of view (most going to other capitalist nations, and not the emergent nations). Restrictions on dividends were lifted, as were those on imports.

It is not surprising therefore, that having spent thirteen years

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

removing controls from the power of capital to invest its money, use its productive forces and distribute its profits as it thought fit, the Tories will fight tooth and nail—inside Parliament and out—to stop such controls being re-imposed. This they have begun to do, and warning lights for the labour movement were seen in the speed with which the Government sought to give assurances in relation to pensions, Bank Rate, Corporation and Capital Gains taxes, and its stated refusal to use any savings made on nuclear weapons for any other purpose than conventional forces.

Henry Fairlie gave pride of place in an article (*Sunday Telegraph*, November 29, 1964), entitled 'Labour Learns the Facts of Life' to the following:

> 'I don't think people realise', one of his (*i.e.*, Mr. Wilson's) Ministers said to me last week, 'how vital it was from the point of view of the philosophy of a Labour Government that we used the surcharge on imports rather than quota restrictions. To win that battle so early, to avoid returning to all the business of controls, that really mattered'.

Assuming its accuracy, one can say that this is the battle cry of surrender—handing over to the enemy one of the most essential weapons in the armoury of a Labour Government: the ability to circumscribe the power of monopoly capital. The fears expressed about 'all the business of controls' stems from the inability to understand that controls are part and parcel of the whole capitalist system —not something brought out every decade or so by a Labour Government. Further, that controls of every kind are powerful weapons used for many purposes by the employers, the landlords and the moneylenders against the people.

It is only necessary to stop and consider a very few of the controls placed on the people by these forces, to understand that to take any measures on behalf of the people, controls must be placed over one aspect or another of the power wielded by capital. Employers and financiers control the possibility or otherwise of the people to find work—a life or death question for all—by their decisions as to the use or closure of factories, yards and workshops. Likewise, their decisions as to the location of new industry (alongside the closure of old) proved sufficient of a control over the people to cause a net migration of 280,000 people from Scotland alone between 1951 and 1961 in search of work. It also produced the near suffocation, in every social sense, of people bunched together (for the employers' convenience) in the Midlands and the South East.

Interest rates—governing the prices of private and council houses alike, plus durable consumer goods—are controlled to a fraction of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a percentage, not by the people for their benefit, but by monopoly capital to serve its own interests. The power of the private building industry for decades to refuse to build dwellings for the poorer sections of the people means that millions have been and still are forced to live in conditions not fit for habitation. Who is controlling whom here?

So it is possible to go on through the list—the control of prices by the manufacturers, the control of capital expenditure by the monopolists, as also the control of production, exports and imports. The question is not, therefore, *whether* Britain is to have controls—these it already has by the thousand. The question is what controls it is to have, who is to impose them, whose interests they will serve, and whose interests they will curb. To take any measure on behalf of the British people, controls must be instituted by Labour, just as the Tories and employers used them against the interests of the people and on behalf of the rich. Effective political, economic or social actions must be counterbalanced by the control of finite—and often powerful—interests. The two are merely cause and effect. To succumb to trick Tory propaganda, painting controls as some form of Socialist devilry—and thus to do nothing to harm moneyed interests—would be to hand over the country to capital and thereby to serve the needs of capital.

It may be that the freedom of capital exporters will have to be restricted in order to win and secure gains for the people; it may be that building work of all kinds will have to be controlled if we are to house our people decently; it may be that the location of new industries will have to be controlled to stop the mass exodus of people from their towns and cities; it may be that prices, profits, dividends, capital expenditure, and a host of other things will have likewise to be controlled.

The simple point is that if these things are not done, then the people of Britain will go on being controlled by the same people who have always had that power. The question is, as we said at the beginning, not controls, but who controls whom.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KINROSS ELECTION PETITION

A Legal Correspondent

'I DO not know', said Lord Kilbrandon, delivering judgment on the petition brought to unseat Sir Alec Douglas-Home for corrupt electoral practices '—neither is it necessary to inquire—what the word "democracy" means in this vocabulary; but in fact the present arrangements are unanimously approved of by the representatives of an overwhelming majority of the electors of Great Britain'. The 'arrangement' to which his Lordship was referring was the agreement concluded between the B.B.C. and officials of the main political parties, whereby only those parties would be allowed to take part in the TV election broadcasts preceding the 1964 General Election, to the exclusion of the Communists and other smaller parties.

Quite apart from the totally unconstitutional procedure by which it was conceived, this agreement was almost certainly a violation of the law. It was unlikely, however, that the B.B.C. were greatly troubled by this point. After all, they could reflect, the law does not operate of its own accord but must be interpreted and enforced by the judges. The B.B.C. as a 'responsible' public organ could expect the full sympathy and understanding of those equally responsible organs, the courts of justice, particularly when the alleged offence consisted solely in preventing Communists and other 'irresponsible elements' from making use of public broadcasting time for spreading 'subversive' ideas.

And so, from the moment the first challenge was issued by the Communist Party the organs of the ruling class, with perfect understanding of the principles at stake, stepped unostentatiously into rôles that were required of them. Writing in another context Engels once remarked 'The parties of order, as they call themselves, are perishing under the legal conditions created by themselves. They cry despairingly . . . legality is the death of us. . . .' In Britain, where bourgeois legality rests on the gentleman's agreement and the old school tie, there is no need for the ruling class to break the law—or even change it—to suit their interests. It simply turns out that the law was never what anyone thought it to be anyway.

The point was to be amply demonstrated when, following the election for the constituency of Kinross and West Perthshire in the 1964 General Election, the Communist candidate Dr. C. M. Grieve

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(better known as Hugh McDiarmid), lodged a petition to unseat the elected Conservative and Unionist candidate, Sir Alec Douglas-Home. The petition alleged that Sir Alec had aided and abetted the B.B.C. to commit breaches of the Representation of the People Act by allowing him and his supporters to appear in a series of election broadcasts addressed to the electors of Kinross, among others, whilst two of the other candidates, Dr. Grieve and the Scottish Nationalist, had been prevented from appearing on any broadcasts at all.

The petition was heard by the Scottish Election Court consisting of two judges of the Court of Session, Lords Migdale and Kilbrandon. Appropriately enough it fell to Dr. Grieve in the witness box to draw attention to the real issues in the case. 'The B.B.C.' he remarked 'is part of the Establishment and is keyed to the requirements of the Establishment'. Undeterred, their Lordships decided without hesitation that the B.B.C. had acted impartially and in good faith and consequently had no intention of promoting Sir Alec's election. The reasoning by which they came to this remarkable conclusion merits further examination.

The relevant statutory provision is S.63 (i) of the Representation of the Peoples Act, 1949:

> No expenses shall, with a view to promoting or procuring the election of a candidate at an election, be incurred by any person other than the candidate, his election agent and persons authorised in writing by the election agent on account . . . of presenting to the electors the candidate or his views or the extent or nature of his backing or disparaging another candidate.

The section further provides that any person who incurs such expenses must make a return of the amount to the Returning Officer. Any breach of these provisions is a corrupt practice and if done with the consent or encouragement of a candidate or his agent may be sufficient to unseat such a candidate if elected to Parliament. Dr. Grieve contended, in effect, that Sir Alec had encouraged the B.B.C. to commit such practices. It could hardly be argued that the broadcasts had not had the effect of promoting the election of one of the candidates. The issue the Court had to decide therefore was whether the expenses which had admittedly been incurred, and for which no return had been made, by the B.B.C. in putting on the broadcasts, had been incurred *with a view to* promoting Sir Alec's election. The reasoning of the court in finding that there was no such intention, is apparent from the following passage in Lord Migdale's judgment:

> Now Sir Hugh Carleton Greene and Sir Robert Fraser both say what they had in mind in arranging, and later in sending out, these programmes

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> in which party representatives appeared and spoke, was to give information to the public, and I see no reason why we should not accept that evidence of intention and motive. It is reinforced by what took place and is in accordance with the requirements of their constitutions. As similar facilities were given to each of the three major political parties, neither Authority can be accused of being partial.

In short, the Court held that the 'dominant intention or motive' of the B.B.C. was to give information to the public and accordingly the expenses were not incurred with the intention of promoting the election of anyone. Presumably, if one is to judge by the observations of their Lordships, this means that when an arrangement is agreed by and is beneficial to 'representatives of an overwhelming majority of electors' this must, for a Scottish Court, represent the law whatever an Act of Parliament may say.

The problem of determining intention is one that has long been familiar to the Courts, particularly in criminal cases where, very often, criminal liability depends upon the fact that the accused committed the Act with a wrongful intention. Normally a man will be presumed to have intended the 'natural consequences' of his act and it will be for him to convince the court to the contrary—normally a very difficult task. But in cases where the accused deliberately performed an act knowing that certain consequences were bound to follow, the courts will not have any regard as to what was his actual motive or desire. In the words of a Court of Appeal judge in a recent case such evidence will be 'manifestly worthless'. This may seem a somewhat artificial interpretation but it must be recalled that in defining 'intention' the judges are in fact seeking to allocate legal responsibility. An example given by Dr. Glanville Williams (see Criminal Law: The General Part, 2nd ed., p. 59) illustrates the point:

> Suppose that D, an eccentric and amoral surgeon, wishes to remove P's heart completely from P's body in order to experiment on it. D does not desire P's death (being perfectly content that P shall go on living if he can without his heart), but recognises that in fact his death is inevitable from the operation to be performed.

D would in law have intended P's death and any evidence as to his 'actual desire' or 'dominant motive', even if believed, would not affect the issue.

In the Kinross case the B.B.C. knew that the inevitable consequence of their decision to exclude Communists and others from the series of political broadcasts was to bring about a state of affairs that S.63 of the Act was clearly intended to prohibit. If one were to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

follow the reasoning adopted in criminal cases, the B.B.C. having deliberately chosen a course of action knowing the consequences, must be taken to have intended those consequences. But no, said Lord Migdale:

> If there is more than one motive, it is the dominant one that has to be looked at. It is irrelevant that putting that intention into operation has also the effect of promoting the election of a candidate.

On this reasoning our eccentric surgeon would be able to plead that he did not intend to kill his victim because his dominant motive was to advance the cause of medical science. This is of course absurd. As the Court of Criminal Appeal said in 1960:

> Intent and desire are different things . . . once it is proved that an accused man knows that a result is certain the fact that he did not desire that result is irrelevant.

Running like a constant theme through the judgment is the argument that the B.B.C. was under a duty to give information about the election; in putting on the election broadcasts it was merely fulfilling this duty, and the fact that each of the main parties was given time proves that the B.B.C. was impartial. This, of course, missed the whole point.

Dr. Grieve was not objecting to the fact that the broadcasts had been put on but that the Communists and other minor parties had been deliberately excluded. In this the B.B.C. had been grossly partial and had deliberately promoted the election of candidates of the main parties at the expense of those of the minor parties. Bearing in mind Lord Kilbrandon's observations it is clear that for the Scottish Election Court the word 'democracy' has no meaning in the context of national elections. That Dr. Grieve's observations about the B.B.C. have a wider application can hardly escape the notice of anyone who studies the court proceedings.

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

TOTtenham 2362

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats,
stoles and capes.

117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone CROydon 4328

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROFITS AND THE SOVIET UNION

Andrew Rothstein

INSPIRED by the example of the ex-Prime Minister, quoted in the November *Labour Monthly* (Russia 'now galloping back to the system of enterprise and reward'), the press continues to jeer at 'profit' discussions in the U.S.S.R. The *Daily Express* December 28) says that 'Communist profit is just like capitalist profit' and advises the Russians to study Marks and Spencer rather than Marx and Engels. *The Economist* (January 2) writes of the 'introduction of the profit motive'. And so on.

Now the curious thing is that for many years past, taxes on the *profits* of public enterprise in the U.S.S.R. (covering industry, transport, agriculture and trade) have been one of the main items on the revenue side of the State Budget, introduced annually at sessions of the Supreme Soviet—the Soviet peoples' parliament. Those interested could find details quoted in the present writer's *Man and Plan in Soviet Economy*, published in 1948. But the Soviet Union's *Statistical Yearbook* for 1962 and 1963 gave total profits of public enterprise in 1940 as 3,149 million roubles and 29,819 million in 1962. For 1965 total profits will be 40,000 million roubles, the Minister of Finance anticipated in his Budget speech on December 9—and the amount taxed into the Budget out of this sum (31,600 million) will represent just under one-third of the total State revenue.

Where have the Sovietologists been all these years? Moreover, as long ago as April 1922, the Eleventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union spoke of the need for the 'profitability' of all State undertakings, while Lenin, in a speech the following November, described with satisfaction the 2 million gold roubles (i.e. £200,000) accumulated in State trade as 'capital' for use in heavy industry. In fact, the word 'profit' has been used in Soviet economic literature to denote the positive cash balances accumulated by Soviet enterprise ever since August 1921.

Have the Sovietologists in our press been unaware of this? It is just possible, since they have always ignored the essential Marxist principles on which the Soviet economy is conducted. Close on ninety years ago, in his *Anti-Dühring*, Engels wrote:

> The whole development of human society beyond the stage of brute savagery begins from the day when the labour of the family created more products than were necessary for its maintenance, from the day when one

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> portion of labour could be devoted to the production, no longer of the mere means of subsistence, but of means of production. A surplus of the product of labour over and above the costs of maintenance of this labour, and the formation and enlargement, by means of this surplus, of a social production and reserve fund, was and is the basis of all social, political and intellectual progress.

In capitalist society this surplus product is appropriated by the private owner (individual or corporate) of the means of production, and becomes surplus value. In Socialist society it is appropriated by the whole people—of which the producer himself is part, and in which he shares when the decision is being taken how to use the surplus product. Whether you call it 'profit' or 'accumulation', does not alter the fact—it has nothing in common with the profit dear to the proprietors of the *Daily Express* and the *Economist*.

And whereas in capitalist economy there really is a 'profit motive' which drives it on—the striving to increase surplus value—in Socialist economy the motive force is the striving to increase the social product, or net income, of society as a whole, and with it the reward of the individual for his labour. In capitalist society the worker is 'alienated' from the means of production on which he works, the product of his labour and the disposal of its surplus—and he has a constant struggle to intervene in an organised way when he wants to reduce that surplus, for the benefit of himself and his fellow-workers. In Socialist society, they and he together control the whole means of production, and its processes, and disposal of the whole product. That is why Socialist emulation, and mass participation in management, and mass effort to make production technically and scientifically more efficient, exist in Socialist society and not in capitalist.

Why then the present discussion about the place of profit in Soviet planning? The reader here should refer to Professor Liberman's article on the subject in the November issue of *Labour Monthly* (with the reservation that, owing to a mistranslation, he was made to speak of surplus *value* being 'necessary for any society to exist and develop', and of profit in the U.S.S.R. being 'the expression in money of surplus *value*' when in each case he spoke in reality of surplus *product*.) In particular, as he pointed out, no individual in the U.S.S.R. can use such profit to exploit hired labour, and thus accumulate the kind of 'reward' Sir Alec and the press had in mind—as the means of production there are in common, not private, ownership (see clause 4 of the Labour Party's constitution).

But a few more comments may be useful here. The Soviet economic system uses money as an implement for more exactly measur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the different values of different persons' labour—but also for measuring the fulfilment of plans for using particular quantities of materials, fuel, equipment and labour-power in production, etc. Such plans include one in every factory for making a stated amount of profit on its work. 'Profit reflects the *financial* results of the activity of the enterprise, its fulfilment of the production targets of the plan', is how one of the standard textbooks on Soviet finance puts it. Profit is peculiarly a measure of the *economies* which the enterprise has achieved—in raw materials, fuel, efficient use of machinery, labour-power—all of which in the long run come down to economies in labour, past or present (for the benefit of unregenerate Sovietologists, this is done with the help, and only with the help, of the workers involved, otherwise it does not work). And lo and behold, Marx wrote over one hundred years ago, when drafting Volume III of *Capital* (published after his death by Engels):

> Reduction of the total quantity of labour incorporated in a commodity seems to be the essential mark of an increase in the productive power of labour, no matter under what sort of social conditions production is carried on. There is no doubt that the productivity of labour would be measured by this standard in a society in which the producers would regulate their production according to a preconceived plan (Chapter XV, Supplementary Remarks).

No prize is offered to Fleet Street editors at this date for guessing what kind of society Marx had in mind.

Hitherto, planned profit has been one among several 'targets' used to judge whether a Soviet factory was doing its job. Other plans cover the total quantities (and classes) of goods produced, the quantities of materials used, the wages bill, delivery date, total cash takings and so on. What has been, and is still being, discussed is whether in present conditions—when the skills and economic knowledge of the workers, their organised contribution to management, their constant innovations and inventions in industrial technique, the productive equipment which they handle, are all so vastly superior to those of the first years of Soviet planning—factory profit might also not be used far more effectively as a major factor in stimulating 'productivity of labour'.

This involves no schemes for departing from the system of planning, as Professor Liberman indicated. On the contrary, it could strengthen it—for example (as others assert) by stimulating improved quality of output. Planned use of raw materials, fuel and new machinery, planned production of particular new commodities, etc., would still be necessary in the national interest, and the aim of increased profit would of necessity have to be combined with them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FEBRU

FIFTY years ago the great Clyde Strike began. The events leading up to it and its results are recorded in William Gallacher's book *Revolt on the Clyde*. It is difficult for us now to get anything like an understanding of the atmosphere which surrounded this strike, taking place as it did in a time when war-fever was spreading like an evil plague, so to give you a picture of those times we reprint extracts from Gallacher's own account.

> Early in February, while the employers were still adamant in their refusal to grant the tuppence increase, a new 'incident' occurred, and the whole Clyde area was brought into action. As a consequence of the rush of recruits in the early days of the war and the great demand for output with which the factories were faced, there was an actual shortage of skilled workers for the engineering shops. . . . Weir's of Cathcart were short of men, so they engaged some in America. They gave them a return ticket from America to Britain, 10s. more a week than their own men were getting . . . and a guaranteed bonus of £10 at the end of six months besides the higher wages. The consequences of such an action might have been foreseen. But, because of the 'patriotic' posturings of the national trade union officials, who were vying with each other in declarations of servility to the war-mongers, the employers were convinced there was no possibility of the workers taking action. They were prepared to put across the rawest deal. But while the national officials were truckling to the Government and being parties to the crime of weakening the trade unions . . . the workers in Cathcart faced the question quite otherwise. . . . War or no war, the workers were going to see that the trades unions did not go out of existence, but would have to be reckoned with as the fighting organs of the working class. . . . What a roar of rage went up from the war-makers! The Press shrieked for action against the leaders. . . . Small business men were venomous. 'The leaders should be shot.' 'It's obvious they're in the pay of the Germans.'. . .
>
> If ever there was a 'spontaneous' strike that called for the support of the national officials, this was the one. We had no objection to American engineers or any others getting jobs; we had no objection to their getting high wages, but we certainly did object, as trade unionists ought to object, to working ourselves at the same job for lower wages. . . . Yet, the A.S.E. officials did everything to break the strike. . . . For a fortnight, under the most terrific barrage ever directed against a strike, we kept going without a break of any kind, despite the fact that not one striker was receiving a penny of strike pay or relief. . . . It was a great strike. The loyalty and solidarity of the workers could not have been higher. . . . The workers of the Clyde had broken through the rotten atmosphere of war-jingoism and stood out, strong and unafraid, ready to defend their class.

This was the start of a period of great working-class struggles and victories on the Clyde, in all of which William Gallacher played a leading part. Opposite we print a picture of him being arrested for 'incitement to riot' four years later.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RY STRIKE

'One of the more kenspeckle strike leaders' is how *The Bulletin* of February 1, 1919, describes Gallacher, seen here, bandaged but smiling, being arrested during the battle of George Square. He was leading a demonstration of 40,000 workers striking for a 40-hour week, when they were savagely attacked by the police.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN AGRICULTURE UNDER SOCIALISM

Jurgen Kuczynski

MANY countries have freed themselves since the end of the second world war from the yoke of imperialism. Under the colonial powers their economic development had been suppressed or directed into channels favourable to the flow of profits for the imperial monopolies and unfavourable to the people of the colonised countries. Now that these countries have freed themselves politically, they realise the importance of building up a sound and healthy economy. This is a difficult task after the enormous damage done to them by the imperialists. It requires new thoughts and experiments and presents many problems.

Under these circumstances imperialist economists have developed a number of 'growth theories' for them: that is, theories how best to develop their economy—again to the advantage of the imperialists. Now, it is one task for Marxist-Leninist thinkers to show up these growth theories for what they are: new tricks to bind the economies of the newly-freed states to those of the old imperialist powers. It is quite another task for them to show constructively new ways of development, leading to the growth of an economy which serves the interests of the people of the newly-liberated countries.

In thinking out new ways a thorough knowledge of older ways of the development of independent economies is needed, as well as a clear insight into the possibilities offered by recent trends in world economic affairs. The most important recent trend is the creation of a new industry—agriculture. The emergence of modern agriculture as an industry, highly mechanised and chemicised must be taken into account when Socialists investigate the possibilities, the ways and means, for the best and fastest economic development of the 'new' countries in the interest of their people.

Let us first look at the way in which the large western capitalist-imperialist powers developed: how they built up their economy. England and the United States, Germany and France all went the same way, the textile-way. They began first to build up a mechanised textile industry which made enormous profits. Part of the profits was used to enlarge continuously the textile industry and part was used for the creation of a textile machinery industry. Later, more and more capital went into the heavy industries—coal, iron and steel and still later an electricity system and electrical products, as well as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a chemical industry were created. Thus a whole industrial system, organic in its growth and its working, was built up.

Undoubtedly, the textile-way was, historically, the best for these countries, but neither the textile nor any other way is the best one for *all* countries. For instance, during the second half of the nineteenth century, India also went the textile way. But she was stopped by the British colonial power and India did not even develop a textile machinery industry—to say nothing of a heavy industry or an electricity system. These could develop only after India freed herself from the colonial yoke.

But it would be wrong to say that no newly-freed country should go the textile-way. If such a country had a large cotton-growing agriculture, there is no reason why it should not develop an important textile industry and textile machinery industry. Bearing in mind that the main task in developing the economy of a country is to develop its economic resources and forces for the benefit of its people, and as these are not the same in every country, then the way of economic development cannot be the same in all countries.

The Soviet Union, the first, and for almost thirty years the only, Socialist country, did not go the textile-way. 'Theoretically' the Soviet Union could also have gone the textile-way, for she was a country free from all capitalist-imperialist interference in her affairs. Had she gone the textile-way she would in the course of time have accumulated sufficient sources for investments in other industries, while at the same time raising steadily and considerably the material standard of living of her people. But the Soviet Union did not live on a dream-island. She was surrounded by imperialist powers, ready to pounce on her at any moment to crush the only Socialist state, the vanguard of the labour movement of the world and the hope of all oppressed people. She, therefore, had to build up a modern, all-round industry as quickly as possible and at the same time produce weapons for her defence, for the defence of the progress of mankind.

Under these circumstances the Soviet Union had to choose the iron and steel-way: a difficult way, a heroic way, sacrificing rapid progress in material well-being for the sake of rapid progress on her revolutionary path. The sequence of world events and the glorious victories of the world proletariat in the last half century, as well as Marxist theory, have proved that the Soviet Union chose the only historically possible, the only historically correct, path towards success. But if that was the only correct and logical way for the first Socialist country, this does not mean that under the present radically

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changed world conditions every new Socialist country must take the iron and steel-way. Just as the textile-way is not a wrong way, because of the case of India, for all newly-liberated countries; so the iron and steel-way is not the only right path for all Socialist countries just because it was the only possible one for the Soviet Union.

Under present-day conditions, with a large and powerful socialist camp in existence and ready to assist a small country politically and economically, the following considerations are necessary in planning economic development:* to fully develop the given material resources of the country; to use all available means of production; to use all specific natural advantages (climate, etc.); and to take all possible advantage of the existing state of the international, especially the socialist division of labour. For the development of a healthy economy the following material factors are necessary: labour power, food for the preservation of the labour power, raw materials, machines, industrial and agricultural buildings, and ways and means of transportation—to name only the most important ones. Some of these factors can be largely (*e.g.*, food) imported in exchange for others richly available in the country concerned. But all of them must be available for the building up of an economy and all of them must be used in the most effective way: that is, guaranteeing the optimum use of the material resources of the country and at the same time a steady rise in the standard of living of the people.

Looked at from this point of view, there are many newly-liberated countries, among them Socialist Cuba, for which the agricultural way of industrialisation appears to be the best. There are, however, objections to this way in quite a number of these countries. Why? No doubt because agriculture was the main branch of economic activity under the colonial régime. The imperialist powers developed agriculture, often as monoculture (mainly coffee, tea or cocoa plantations). Labour was either direct or indirect (*e.g.*, through high poll taxes) forced labour, extremely poorly paid, and because labour was kept so cheap, the technical stage of agriculture was very low. The productivity of labour was low. The producers of food lacked food and lived in extreme poverty.

Other branches of the economy were barely developed, with the exception of metal mines which brought great profits to their colonial owners. So, it is only too understandable that with this background they look upon agriculture as backward and enslaving and want to build industrial undertakings.

*The author is here dealing only with countries whose task is not to create a large all-round economy, such as China or India must build up.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But modern agriculture is quite different from the old-fashioned and colonial agriculture. Under modern conditions the problem 'agricultural or industrial way' does not exist any more. The modern agricultural way is one of many possible industrial ways. Modern agriculture has become a branch of industry. If we keep this in mind then we can overcome the—historically easily understandable—prejudice against the development of agriculture as one way of industrialising and mechanising the economy of a country. With this in mind, we shall be able to conceive of the agricultural way to industrialisation as a very important and advantageous method for many newly-liberated countries, and as a way which will bring economic health and material well-being, political and economic sovereignty to many countries.

The first socialist country in the world which has purposely chosen this way, the agricultural-way to industrialisation, is Cuba. Cuba is concentrating on the production of agricultural goods, mainly sugar, but also tobacco, tropical fruits, livestock and livestock products. She will raise them in the modern agricultural way, achieving high productivity through mechanisation and chemicisation. The building up of a sugar chemical industry, the construction of sugar-agricultural machinery will be among the many important results of this new way of agricultural industrialisation. Of course, a considerable part of the building industry, with the most modern methods of prefabrication, will be directed towards agriculture, and the same holds true of road building.

In the universities and scientific research institutions this new trend in Cuba's economy will have important consequences. Book and pamphlet production will shift their weight towards questions of agriculture and agricultural industrialisation. New chapters will be written in the science of political economy by Cuba; new chapters in sociology and history; new lessons will be given to us by Cuba on the tactics and strategy of the class struggle, of the struggle against imperialism. Cuba's way is a pioneer way of the greatest importance, not only for the building up of socialism there, but also to show the way for many countries not yet socialist, but up to now only non-capitalist. She will be an example especially for many Latin American countries in the process of freeing themselves from American imperialism.

The eyes of hundreds of millions are on Cuba, for, in making sure of the most modern developments of the productive forces of the world, she goes a new way towards new goals leading her to the common goal of all mankind: the final stage of communism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AUTOMATION AND THE OFFICE WORKER

B. G. Stacey

WHILE the mechanisation of office work has been going on for over half a century, a revolutionary development has taken place in the last twelve years. Electronic equipment has been applied to virtually all branches of office work and its use is steadily expanding. The most important piece of equipment is the computer. A great deal of office work can be reduced to simple routine and routine operations are easy to automate. In some ways office work is easier to automate than the production of goods: figures and letters have none of the inconvenient natural properties of materials.

Although automation has been an important subject of discussion in the labour movement, it is often assumed that it does not differ basically from earlier forms of mechanisation. This assumption is not justified. The early office machines were designed to simplify and speed up particular operations, and involved little or no change in organisation. Both punched card machinery and electronic equipment necessitate the introduction of a completely rationalised system of work organisation which eliminates many old jobs and skills. Automation also encourages the trend towards the centralisation of administrative and clerical functions, thus promoting the development of government, commercial and educational data processing centres. Further, there are growing possibilities for small and medium sized firms to use computers with the expansion of facilities for the hiring of time on a computer. All this will affect the working life of an increasing number of office workers.

The physical environment and working conditions of office workers have undergone many changes during this century. Though there has been a general tendency for conditions to improve, much still needs to be done. There are many instances of very old buildings being used for office work. Overcrowding in offices is common and lighting, heating, ventilation, noise level, cleanliness and sanitary facilities are far too often below a reasonable standard. The automation of office work does have some beneficial effects on the physical environment and working conditions of employees. Lighting, space and cleanliness requirements are usually specified to ensure efficiency and low maintenance costs. But there are some unfavourable consequences. The office environment becomes much more like a factory, with a constant high level of noise and vibration from the equip-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. Employees have to spend much more time on their feet and the speed with which the equipment operates, frequently entails a rapid, continuous working pace.

Electronic equipment does not produce physical fatigue, as some mechanical equipment does. However, there is pressure for fast work in the preparation of data to maximise the volume of work carried out by the equipment. The tension and strain produced by the monotonous, repetitive nature of much of the work and the continuing vigilance required in the performance of the job is a much more important danger than physical fatigue. A number of studies have pointed to a comparatively high incidence of nervous disorders among clerical workers in automated offices, particularly among those who have been required to adapt themselves to new techniques.

A widespread belief exists that a shortening of the working week and a lengthening of holidays will result 'naturally' from the automation of office work. There is no evidence to support this belief. Changes in the future will undoubtedly depend on the state of the economy and the strength of the trade unions, not upon any 'natural' development. If employers insist on using electronic equipment to capacity, shift work will be introduced where it was not common before. Replies to the T.U.C. Non-Manual Workers' Committee questionnaire* showed that there is already a trend to shift working. This development has many implications for office workers and their families. Further, the introduction of night work would restrict the employment opportunities of women.

In the past there have been several changes in the nature of office work and in the type of skills required of office employees. The early machines eliminated a great deal of laborious routine work but did not displace skilled work. But the introduction of automation necessitates an entire re-organisation of work procedures and completely changes the patterns of skill requirements in the office. The impact depends largely on the previous degree of mechanisation. Where a computer system is introduced directly into a 'manually' operated office, the change will radically alter the organisation of work procedures, produce very different skill requirements and substantially reduce the size of the staff. Where a computer system is introduced into an office having punched-card machinery, there will not be so many changes and the reduction in the size of the staff will not be so great. In the automated office there is no need for a large number of semi-skilled workers. There is a need for a small number of skilled

*'In the Automated Office', T.U.C., London, 1964.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

technical workers. In the future the number of these required will diminish as the highly skilled work is simplified and standardised.

Such development raises the problem of training and retraining for employment in the automated office. At present training facilities are inadequate. Most organisations tackle this as well as they can, often with some help from the manufacturer of the equipment. There is an urgent need for the government and local authorities to take on the task of providing adequate training and retraining facilities. This can only be accomplished by utilising the institutions of higher education. A particularly grave problem arises with older workers who find it difficult to adapt to the new technology and who have to change their job in a deteriorating employment situation. Many employers are prejudiced against middle-aged, aged and married women. These are likely to become vulnerable groups.

Changes in the nature of skill requirements are accompanied by changes in the organisation of office work. The specialisation of office functions is intensified. There is a marked tendency towards a highly centralised arrangement of administrative work. This means that many workers will be obliged to transfer from one area to another, usually to a major city. Such movement is expensive and difficult for married people with families, accommodation and ties in a particular locality. The elimination of the 'middle' levels of skill will virtually eliminate chances of promotion for the workers concerned with the dull, routine work. This is bound to promote frustration and discontent among them.

For a variety of reasons it is difficult to assess the exact effects of advancing automation on the office labour force. Britain as a colonial power engaging in trade on a world-wide scale, has an unduly high proportion of its working population in the office sector. Any future political changes which restrict or eliminate the scope of foreign operations by British companies could decrease the need for such a large proportion of the labour force to be employed in office work. The relatively slow rate at which automation is being introduced will, at some time, give way to rapid development. The immediate result of automation may not be deleterious for the existing labour force, but the general long-term tendency in this sphere will be the elimination of jobs and a reduction of employment opportunities for rising generations.

Because the mechanisation of office work did not create serious problems there is a generally complacent attitude to the development of office automation in Britain. The General Council of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T.U.C. covered automation in a brief and vague manner at Congress in 1963 and 1964. The T.U.C. Non-Manual Workers' Committee Survey 'In the Automated Office', is a very limited document. It simply states that 'few redundancy problems have so far confronted the unions' and admits that there is 'a difficult road ahead if full employment of clerical staff is to be maintained'. There is no historical or political perspective, and developments abroad are ignored. Nor does it deal with the distribution of the increased wealth which will accrue from automation.

Today the labour movement cannot afford to ignore the office workers and their families. The importance of this section of the population and the problems it is facing must be widely appreciated in the trade union movement and on the political left. Many employers and trade unionists have long regarded office workers as quiescent staff personnel, right wing in politics and willing to put up with almost anything. In fact for some years trade union membership has been steadily expanding among them. Increasingly, office workers are becoming aware of their need to act collectively to improve salaries and working conditions and to protect their interests. The growth of monopoly, bringing large office units employing hundreds of clerks, and the consequences of advancing automation are rapidly bringing to an end the old social relations of the office. Those relations were based on the supposed common interest between owner and office worker and their joint 'superiority' over the factory worker. As automation advances on a wide scale there will be a real chance to expand the organisation and activities of office workers and draw them closer to the workers in the manual unions. They must be given assistance and encouragement by the manual unions. Such assistance will help to develop an awareness of common interests between office and factory workers.

Politically it should become possible to undermine Conversatism in a section of the population the Tories have traditionally relied upon. In recent years office workers, just as much as factory workers, have suffered from rising prices, house costs, rents, rates, fares and so forth. During the sixties many of them abandoned the Conservative Party. The labour movement must attempt to promote the development of a class consciousness among these workers, engage them in the struggle against the policies of the monopolists and relate their political interests to those of the factory workers and the professionals. If this can only be partly achieved the political left in Britain will be greatly strengthened.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL NAZI CRIMINALS GO FREE?

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

THE West German government has recently announced that war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by Nazis during the Second World War will no longer be subject to prosecution in West Germany after May 8, 1965, on the ground that the twenty-year limitation on prosecutions for murder under West German law will run out on that date. The Government has decided not to legislate to prolong or abolish the limitation, whilst all around it—already in the U.S.S.R., East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Belgium, and soon probably in France—legislation is being passed to that effect. The result is that, if the West German government is not forced to change its mind, hordes of Nazi war criminals will go streaming back from their refuges in South Africa, South America, and other countries to join their numerous (according to Mr. Kempner, U.S. prosecutor at Nuremberg, at least 10,000, and according to other authoritative estimates 27,000) fellow criminals in high political, judicial, or police posts in West Germany; this would make the country—already so corrupted by Neo-Nazism and Revanchism that even the Social Democrats at their recent annual conference displayed a huge outline map of Germany *as it stood in 1917* with the slogan: 'Our heritage and our task'—an even more dangerous focus of aggression than it already is.

The announcement is accompanied by an appeal to all who know of any war crimes still unprosecuted to report them to the government so that proceedings can be launched before the twenty years expire. This is the purest hypocrisy, for—apart from a few courageous efforts by the prosecutors in one or two Laender, such as the Auschwitz case now running—West Germany has not shown the slightest desire to prosecute any of the many criminals infesting its government and its country. (For example, in the judicial field alone, of 1,188 persons at present exercising judicial functions in West Germany and denounced as war criminals by the German Democratic Republic, on clear evidence from the dossiers of cases in which they took part in the Nazi time, not one has been prosecuted.)

This is not just a legal scandal, but far more a moral and political one; but the legal background needs a little explanation. 'Limitation' of crimes, *i.e.*, the provision by law that they can only be prosecuted within so many years of their commission, is not universal—for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

example, in Britain, there is no limitation at all for any but minor offences—but every country can provide for it if and how it chooses, just as it can say what constitutes a crime and can fix the punishment for it. War crimes and crimes against humanity, however, are not just offences against the law of Germany or of any other states, but are crimes defined by international law, and are not subject to any limitation—they are indeed by their horrible character peculiarly unfitted to be ever freed by limitation. West Germany has no constitutional right to impose any limitation on these crimes; it is indeed under a clear and definite obligation to prosecute them, since Art. 25 of that country's Constitution lays down that the 'general rules of international law are an integral part' of the law of the country, taking precedence of all the laws of the country and directly creating rights and duties for all persons within the Republic.

It is clear, of course, that the black-coated bandits who rule West Germany will pay no attention to these obligations, and will neither prosecute these criminals nor prolong or abolish the twenty-year limitation unless forced by overwhelming pressure of public opinion. The most satisfactory solution of the problem would be to re-establish an international court to try these innumerable and horrible cases—the nature of which, if I had space to relate one or two of them, would put an end to any sentiment of 'Let bygones be bygones'—but we can be sure that the U.S. government would not be likely to incommode their West German cold-war accomplices by agreeing to any such step.

As it stands, then, the impasse can only be broken by the pressure of public opinion in West Germany and outside. It is encouraging that such pressure has already begun in West Germany—not only in left-wing circles; and it is growing outside that country too. It will inevitably meet with the strongest resistance from the government and the ruling-class of West Germany. That class is essentially the same financial-industrial group that put Hitler in power and kept him there, for its own profit; it not only sympathises with its fellow-Nazis who committed these hideous crimes while its own members sat at their desks and ordered the crimes, but it needs them in order to provide sufficient cadres of tough and unscrupulous servants for its aggressive policies in Europe (for which we are asked to give it access to nuclear weapons).

One unexpected advantage for the forces of decency is that the Government of West Germany and the whole political situation there is at present far more unstable than at any previous time; but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever the advantages or the difficulties, the struggle everywhere in Europe and the whole world to ensure that these abominable criminals are not given certificates of immunity by West Germany but are prosecuted must be carried on to full success.

ANTHROPOLOGISTS MEET IN MOSCOW

R. Frankenberg

[*In view of the incitement to racial hatred in recent election campaigns in this country, and the distorted ideas peddled by racists, our readers may be interested to see the conclusions drawn by a recent International Conference of Anthropologists.—Ed.*, L.M.]

IN August, 1964, over 2,000 scientists from many countries, East and West, attended in Moscow, the seventh International Congress of Ethnological and Anthropological Sciences. The subjects that interest ethnologists and anthropologists proved to be many—nothing human is alien to them. Increasing written contact during recent years between scientists from the West and from the Socialist countries through the medium of such journals as the international *Current Anthropology* was transformed into meeting in real life. Names became faces.

After an opening meeting in the great hall of Moscow's famous university in the Lenin Hills, delegates dispersed to their sections for discussions on their specialities. There were no less than twenty-seven sections ranging from the biological (physiological and anatomical anthropology, the origins of man), through the cultural (linguistics, folk arts, poetry music and theatre), and the social (religious beliefs, social forms and institutions) to applied anthropology and theory and methodology. Regional sections heard specialised papers on Africa, Australia and Oceania, the Far East, and other regions of the World.

One discussion which raised wide interest was that on the recently discovered fossil man of East Africa—Homo Habilis. This has been classified not only on the usual criteria of anatomical characteristics but also on the tools found near him, a controversial procedure. (A popular excursion during the week was to see Professor Gerasimov's model reconstructions of fossil men.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the field of theory and methodology there was much interest in evolutionary theories of the development of society. After four days of sectional meetings and the presentation of more than nine hundred papers, the delegates turned to more informal discussion in the form of seventeen symposia. The most popular of these and the scene of much hard-hitting controversy was that on Lewis H. Morgan. Was his periodisation of the history of primitive society, which Engels admired so much and put to such good use in the *Origin of the Family* still acceptable in the light of modern knowledge?

Another lively nine hours or so of discussion was devoted to the study of customs and behaviour in modern urban and industrial society. Discussion raged in English, French, Russian, German and Italian and reprinted articles were feverishly exchanged. The Poles in particular had exciting research work to report. Interpreters emerged tired, battered and (usually) triumphant. The interpreters, who were also guides and helpers, were among the major delights of the conference. They were mainly young graduates who had volunteered to forsake their research for a week to attend to the needs of the delegates. Their enthusiasm and friendly sense of purpose inspired confidence in the future of the Soviet Union.

As the majority of delegates left for home or for special tours of Soviet Armenia and other republics and regions, some of the leading physical anthropologists stayed behind for a meeting sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation to revise the official Unesco statement on race.* Since 1951, when its first statement on race was issued, Unesco has published useful books and pamphlets exposing the sham science of racist literature and argument. However, many physical anthropologists and human biologists were discontented with some of the formulations and wanted the statement revised. The problem had become urgent because of the emergence of new groups of what have been called 'scientific racists' and the publication of books and journals promulgating their views. One such journal is widely circulated free to many who have no desire to receive it. In 1962 the American Association of Physical Anthropologists issued a statement which said among other things that they deplored 'the misuse of science to advocate racism' and went on 'we affirm as we have in the past, that there is nothing in science that justifies the denial of opportunities or rights to any group by virtue of race'. The British Royal Anthropo-

*For an abridged version of the 1951 statement see p. 86.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logical Institute faces a libel action because of its publication of a letter by a now dead Yugoslav physical anthropologist attacking racism. The distinguished scientist Juan Comas has led the counter attack against new racist theories, as he has in the past spoken out against Hitler and fascist distortions. He writes from Mexico. From England he has had the support of Sir Julian Huxley, J. B. S. Haldane and many others and from the Soviet Union, V. Bunak and M. Masturkh. The latter's book on the *Races of Mankind* was recently published in English by the Foreign Languages Publishing House.

A draft statement was unanimously agreed by the twenty-two experts at this Moscow gathering, which differed only slightly from the original 1951 statement, but in some important respects. Like the original, the new statement affirms that all human beings belong to a single biological species and that racial differences are solely of biological origin and have no necessary relationship to national boundaries, to language, to culture or religion. But it emphasises that 'peoples of the earth have biological possibilities for attaining any level of civilisation' and that 'differences between achievements' must be explained 'wholly by their cultural history'. Another important addition to the 1951 statement is on the question of intermarriage. The new draft says that intermarriage contributes to the maintenance of biological ties between human groups and thus to the unity of the species. Unesco are organising another conference of experts in 1966 'to consider the social and ethical aspects' and the findings of this recent meeting will be incorporated in a declaration which is expected to replace or supplement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948.

APPENDIX

Abridged text for the 1951 Statement on Race

1. Scientists are generally agreed that all men living today belong to a single species, *Homo sapiens,* and are derived from a common stock, even though there is some dispute as to when and how different human groups diverged from this common stock. . . . In its anthropological sense, the word 'race' should be reserved for groups of mankind possessing well-developed and primarily heritable physical differences from other groups. . . .

2. Some of the physical differences between human groups are due to differences in hereditary constitution and some to differences in the environments in which they have been brought up. In most cases, both influences have been at work. . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. National religious, geographical, linguistic and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups; and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated connexion with racial traits. . . .

4. Human races can be, and have been classified in different ways by different anthropologists. Most of them agree in classifying the greater part of existing mankind into at least three large units. . . . Such a classification does not depend on any single physical character, nor does, for example, skin colour by itself necessarily distinguish one major group from another. Furthermore, so far as it has been possible to analyse them, the differences in physical structure which distinguish one major group from another give no support to popular notions of any general 'superiority' or 'inferiority' which are sometimes implied in referring to these groups. . . .

5. Most anthropologists do not include mental characteristics in their classification of human races. Studies within a single race have shown that both innate capacity and environmental opportunity determine the results of tests of intelligence and temperament, though their relative importance is disputed. . . . The normal individual, irrespective of race, is essentially educable. It follows that his intellectual and moral life is largely conditioned by his training and by his physical and social environment. . . .

6. The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups. . . .

7. There is no evidence for the existence of so-called 'pure' races. As there is no reliable evidence that disadvantageous effects are produced thereby, no biological justification exists for prohibiting inter-marriage between persons of different races.

8. We now have to consider the bearing of these statements on the problem of human equality. We wish to emphasise that equality of opportunity and equality in law in no way depend, as ethical principles, upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment.

9. We have thought it worth while to set out in a formal manner what is at present scientifically established concerning individual and group differences.

(*a*) In matters of race, the only characteristics which anthropologists have so far been able to use effectively as a basis for classification are physical (anatomical and physiological).

(*b*) Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development.

(*c*) Some biological differences between human beings within a single race may be as great as or greater than the same biological differences between races.

(*d*) Vast social changes have occurred that have not been connected in any way with changes in racial type. Historical and sociological studies thus support the view that genetic differences are of little significance in determining the social and cultural differences between different groups of men.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CITRINE AND THE TUC

Arthur Horner

FOR those who lived and worked in the vicinity of Walter Citrine during the twenties and thirties, his autobiography* provides very interesting reading. Walter Citrine, the man, was completely honest in all his personal transactions, but I would not say as much in favour of his intellectual honesty. He was a very conceited and self-opinionated man who could never appreciate the reasoning of others who arrived at different conclusions from him in any given situation. He lacked profound understanding of the purpose and destiny of the working-class movement. He never conceived a system of society which was fundamentally different from that of capitalism. His ultimate aim was the improvement of working-class standards within the limits of that system. He did stand out, however, as a highly efficient administrator of the Trades Union Congress and its organisation, and was undoubtedly responsible for the detailed efficiency which it exercises under the supervision of George Woodcock who was, and is still, a prodigy of Citrine's methods.

He had certain reservations which are not generally held by orthodox trade union leaders. He never accepted the full unity of a political party with the trade union movement, and certainly refused to subordinate the trade union movement to the Labour Party.

I remember the Hull T.U.C. of 1924 when Citrine and Tomsky, the leader of the Russian trade union movement, had frequent private discussions as to whether there could be in Russia a trade union movement which could be independent and free to pursue its trade union aims if that movement, then ten million strong, was organisationally and ideologically closely knit with the Communist Party which was responsible for the government of the Soviet Union. He refers on page 210 of his book to an incident which occurred when visiting A. J. Cook in Manor House hospital in 1931, when Mosley and Lansbury were present, at the time when the social service cuts had taken place. Citrine on this occasion argued that because of their association with the Labour Government they were not free to criticise the obnoxious measures taken at that time. George Woodcock today pursues the same struggle for the independence of the T.U.C. from the Labour Party.

---

*_Men and Work_, Sir Walter Citrine, Hutchinson, 40s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Citrine describes destitution and unemployment which prevailed especially following the General Strike. Incidentally he contends this did not deserve that title, because only one million and a half participated in it and should have been called a national strike. I do not accept this because there were few occasions when any workers in that historic period failed to respond where it was found that action by them was necessary.

There is not complete honesty in his revelations about this period, although there is a picture of him addressing an unemployed demonstration in Hyde Park in 1933. It would have been more creditable had he mentioned that in 1927 a circular was sent out from the T.U.C. over his signature urging local trades councils not to give any assistance or hospitality to Welsh miners who were marching from South Wales to London. This circular was issued probably under instructions from the General Council. If so he should have made that clear. To remain silent about it is impermissible. As a participant in this march, I, though employed as a check-weigher, got leave of absence and was chosen on many occasions to visit trades councils to urge them to assist marchers and to defy the T.U.C. instructions. During that period, and whilst we were in London, a deputation was chosen to meet the General Council. But even the officials, Ben Turner and Citrine, refused to meet us if Wally Hannington, the leader of the march, was allowed to participate in the discussions. We compromised to the extent that Hannington should not take part in the discussions although he would remain in the room. Citrine's grounds were that Hannington was not a miner, the real reason being that he was the secretary of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement. It is remarkable that a book of this size does not mention this organisation, or the wonderful work it did for the unemployed especially when a joint advisory committee on unemployment had been set up between the T.U.C. and the N.U.W.M. after the Plymouth T.U.C. in 1923.

There are many references to A. J. Cook, who became general secretary of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, for which Citrine alleges that I was principally responsible. This is, of course, nonsense because Cook was democratically elected by individual ballot vote of the miners.

Citrine, on page 77, refers to a conversation between himself and Fred Bramley in which Bramley is stated to have said: 'Have you seen who has been elected secretary of the Miners' Federation? Cook, a raving tearing Communist. Now the miners are in for a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bad time.' To which Citrine adds: 'I little knew how prophetic Bramley's words were to prove'. By implication this was putting the whole responsibility for what happened to the mining community on A. J. Cook, which is, of course, rubbish. Citrine himself confirms this view by the evidence he puts in his own book.

On page 139 he quotes Cook as saying prior to 1926: 'I am going to fight these people. I believe a fight is certain. There may be a postponement, but a fight is certain. There is only one way of going it. That is to fight!' To which Citrine replied: 'Yes, but make sure you are fighting with discretion'. And then he states Cook said: 'Don't forget I have something to pay back. It is just six years ago since they not only handcuffed me but led me in chains from one end of the train, in Swansea station, to the other in full view of the public. The same at Cardiff station.'

Cook did undergo this experience. I was one of the six chained to him. But to imply that Cook involved the mineworkers of Britain and their families in such great sacrifices out of personal spleen or for revenge is quite unforgiveable.

However, following the T.U.C. at Swansea in 1928, when Cook collapsed whilst making his speech at the rostrum and was conveyed by ambulance to his hotel, Citrine visited him and as a consequence of what took place Citrine taking advantage of the state of Cook's health, persuaded him to modify his views and to become a 'good boy'. The pressure which the T.U.C. and certain leaders of the miners exercised against Cook when he was suffering from cancer of the leg, from which he ultimately died, is one of the most disgraceful episodes in British trade union history, and explains the change in Cook's attitude in the last few years of his life.

There are many experiences described in this book which are worth analysing and from which many conclusions would be drawn quite different from those drawn by Lord Citrine. As a craftsman he is as meticulous in his biography as he undoubtedly was in his trade as an electrician. The period covered terminates in 1939 and it will be interesting to analyse his role not as a trade union leader but as a member of the National Coal Board and Chairman of the Electricity Board.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pergamon Press Publications

British Political Issues

In Two Volumes

E Liggett, *Tutor Organizer, Workers' Educational Association*

An informative survey providing a ground plan of political debate, with a sound factual framework for the study of political parties and their programmes. Sections on political, economical, social, industrial and defence questions are included, and the introduction provides historical and philosophical comment co-ordinating the whole of the contents.

The Commonwealth and International Library

270 pages, 20s flexi-cover 30s hard cover
386 pages, 27s 6d flexi-cover 35s hard cover
Volume 1 Volume 2

Giro Credit Transfer Systems

Popular International Facilities for Economic Efficiency

F P Thomson

This, the first book in the English language on the subject, makes a detailed examination of the giro system and shows how its principles have profoundly benefited the national economy of participating countries and have also produced important social improvements unattainable by any other single method.

The Commonwealth and International Library

192 pages, 15s flexi-cover 25s hard cover

Harold Wilson

A Pictorial Biography

M Foot, MP

While this is essentially a pictorial biography, the text by Michael Foot is a brilliant summary of the main triumphs of Harold Wilson's career and shows not only the dedicated approach to politics and zeal for the welfare of the Labour Movement which have made him such a formidable leader, but also the human and understanding side of the man.

100 pages, 67 photographs and cartoons, 12s 6d

George Brown

A Profile of the First Secretary of State and Minister of Economic Affairs in the New Labour Government

by Cassandra

William Connor, who is 'Cassandra' of the *Daily Mirror*, gives his view of Brown with the wit and political insight gained from twenty years of political reporting. Brown's career and its relation to Labour Party developments makes fascinating reading.

96 pages, 60 photographs, 12s 6d

Offered for sale by

Robert Maxwell & Co Ltd

International University and Industrial Booksellers

Waynflete Building, 4 St Clements, Oxford,
4-5 Fitzroy Square, London W 1
2-3 Teviot Place, Edinburgh 1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

Corridors of Power

C. P. Snow

Macmillan. 25s. 408 pp.

Now that C. P. Snow has become Lord Snow his latest novel *Corridors of Power* has additional interest. As junior minister to Mr. Frank Cousins at the Ministry of Technology, he will have an influential position from which to press his views on nuclear warfare.

In this work he assigns to Tory Cabinet Minister Roger Quaife the formidable task of trying to win his Government and Party to abandon the British nuclear 'independent deterrent'. As the action takes place between the years 1955 to 1958 it is clear from the start that Mr. Quaife will fail. In telling the tale through the well known Lewis Eliot character of C. P. Snow's *Strangers and Brothers* series of which this is the newest addition, some of the veil which covers Tory politics is lifted. There are the political intrigues and uncompromising personal rivalries for position and power which occasionally leak into the press.

With intimate and convincing detail the characters plot and counter plot in their dinner parties and week ends at the house of one of the political hostesses which are part of the unceasing political battle in top Tory circles. With customary skill the author introduces the arguments for and against keeping nuclear weapons and we are left with the inescapable conclusions that they menace mankind.

He chooses an emigré Russian-hating Polish scientist, who wants more spent on nuclear weapons, as his medium for showing the extremes to which the supporters of nuclear bombs are prepared to go. This man is quite willing to face a war with three hundred million dead and economic ruin to further his hatred of communism. He is instrumental in getting the secret political police now called 'security services' to screen Eliot and others supporting Roger Quaife and it is a nasty experience in which ex-communist informers are not spared.

Thus we see more than is told in most recent political novels about the rôle top civil servants and scientists play in formulating government policies, in this instance, military policy. On this plane, all the action takes place in an ivory tower atmosphere without reference to other political issues from which nuclear policy arises. Naturally no attempt is made by the Cabinet Minister Roger Quaife to stir the people to act in his support. So he fails. Refusing to compromise, he resigns and his political career which includes his seat in Parliament draws to a close.

Lewis Eliot also resigns from his position as a temporary civil servant. In doing so he explains that there were some things he wanted to help get done. 'I thought we might do them this way, on the quiet. Now I do not think we can. Or at least, there's nothing more I can do on the quiet. I shall have to be a private citizen again.' If that is a recognition that mass action is needed to keep peace it is indeed welcome.

PETER ZINKIN.

Film World

Ivor Montagu

Penguin Books. 6s. 328 pp.

SOON AFTER I became the General Secretary of the Association of Cinematograph, Television and Allied Technicians, I went to the Lime

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grove Studios to seek the help and advice of Ivor Montagu, one of our Union's founder and office-holding members. In addition to being Hitchcock's associate producer, Ivor was active in the table tennis world, and a distinguished zoologist. He was a keen student of politics and being concerned, as we all were, about the Spanish Civil War, he eventually went filming for the Republicans. All these interests, except zoology, we shared in common and it has always amazed me how Ivor continues to be the perfect example of the man who belies the adage of 'Jack of all trades, master of none', for he tackles nothing on which he does not become an authority. His book is just another example.

Most film books are quickly read and still more quickly forgotten. *Film World* will remain an authority to be quoted for many years. He ranges over the whole field: film as science, film as art, film as commodity and film as vehicle. Every aspect of the medium is covered: its history, its resemblance to and difference from other arts, its aesthetic laws, the compound effects of sound and vision, the business side and the monopolistic tendencies.

Not unnaturally the book follows the film trade union's line of a third circuit as part of a national sector competing with the privately-owned interests. 'Full nationalisation', its author says, 'will come in Britain in films, if ever, only following and as part of, far-reaching social change.' Ivor debunks many of the old myths such as phoney documentary. Flaherty particularly comes in for stringent criticism, each of whose masterpieces, the author claims, is a lie, an evasion of the truth about society. He draws freely on his work and association with the great film makers, Eisenstein, Chaplin, Hitchcock and others, and generally brings a breath of fresh air into the whole film scene. The book is definitely a 'must' for all students of film, film history and film economics.

GEORGE ELVIN.

Some Essential Features of Nkrumahism
(Articles from *The Spark*)
Lawrence & Wishart. 56 pp. 2s. 6d.

THIS BOOK is a reproduction of a series of articles in which the Ghanaian newspaper *The Spark* outlines the main features of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's contribution to Ghanaian and African thought.

Nkrumah stresses the need for a 'scientific revolutionary theory' (p. 1) based on 'Marxist analysis' and embracing the aim of 'African unity' (p. 2). He describes the work of Marx and Lenin as 'the most searching and penetrating analysis of economic imperialism' (p. 5) and makes use of this analysis in his own work and thought.

Nkrumah sees the need for the independence movement to 'root itself and secure its basis and strength in the labour movement, the farmers (the workers and peasantry) and the youth' (p. 7). He is fully aware of the corruption by imperialism of part of the intelligentsia, 'the kind of intelligentsia who have become the very architects of colonial enslavement' (p. 8), though in education the intellectuals can play a positive rôle, which must be 'to clear the way for the upsurge of a powerful labour movement' (Ibid). Hence the struggle becomes one for 'the total reconstruction of society' conducted by 'workers, peasants and youth' (p. 9).

In the national movements of Africa, Nkrumah sees two main trends, 'the moderates of the profes-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sional and "aristocratic" class and the so-called extremists of the mass movement' (p. 11). He sees a one-Party system as playing a positive rôle when the so-called 'extremist' wing is in power, with the aim of 'social reconstruction and the creation of a socialist society.' But if the 'moderates' of the intellectual and aristocratic class get into power, a neo-colonialist régime comes into being and a second party must come into being to push the national liberation movement to complete victory' (p. 18).

In Ghana the Convention People's Party was formed as a party of national unity against imperialism. Today, with the turn towards socialism, Nkrumah is striving to take along with him as large a part as possible of this national movement. Scientific socialism is now stated to be the official doctrine of the Party, and in its application to African conditions Nkrumah is striving to unite the majority of the Ghanaian people.

One of the legacies of colonialism in Africa is the network of 'national' frontiers which in origin were no more than a matter of convenience to the rival imperialisms. But in the world of today only a re-united Africa will be capable of defending itself against neo-colonialism. Hence Nkrumah's dictum that 'the independence of Ghana is meaningless until it is linked with the total liberation of Africa' (p. 29) and the conception of a united continent in which the separate governments accept 'overall economic planning, unified military and defence strategy, and unified foreign policy and diplomacy' (p. 33). Nkrumah thus visualises a dual task; the creation of a socialist Ghana and the forging of African unity which 'will create some of the necessary objective conditions for the rapid advance towards socialism not only in a single African state but throughout the African continent' (p. 35).

The creation of a united socialist-orientated Africa is a tremendous task. In his book *Consciencism* Nkrumah endeavours to provide a philosophical basis for such unity. The book *Some Essential Features of Nkrumahism* is mainly based on Nkrumah's *Consciencism* (reviewed in *Labour Monthly*, June, 1964). For the fullest understanding of Nkrumah's policy and outlook, his book *Consciencism* should be read, in addition to the popular exposition of his views contained in the book reviewed here.

PAT SLOAN.

In the Beginning Was Fear

N. M. Seedo

Narod Press. 498 pp. 30s.

THIS IS A WORTHWHILE book despite its defects. It is written by a Rumanian Jewess and is based upon the life of the authoress, whose many terrible experiences have seared a fearful and animated picture of fear upon her mind. Her struggles amid the persecution of her people have tended to create tremendous contradictory conflicts within her mind which she struggles to synthesise. She strives to paint her narrative objectively, but subjectivity based upon an early religious upbringing constantly breaks through in long philosophical discourses which often bewilder and irritate the reader.

The story of her life is movingly written with great depth of feeling and emotion and often in a poetic style. Her chapters on the pogroms live and her writing on her father's death is most moving. The narrative of her friend Miriam, who dies in the Resistance, is beautiful and the story of her love affair with her tutor is human and revealing of both

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her and Miriam's religious ties, which in spite of their growing revolutionary outlook they are unable to break. Of course the central theme of the book is that of the Jews and their Ghetto life and it is precisely because of the special contradictions and conflicts which such life engenders that the authoress launches into philosophical discussions.

The whole of these philosophical soliloquies, which range over a vast canvas of human emotions and behaviour, are often expressed in a mystique that is shadowly reminiscent of the Talmud, in which the writer tells us she is well versed. These philosophical attempts to synthesise and rationalise her mental conflicts, arising out of the contradictions of life (particularly Jewish life), are sad because they reflect the tragedy of a politically conscious Jewess, who in fighting and struggling for a free and just world, dimly, and perhaps resentfully, perceives that in such a world Jewry, as she has always known it, will disappear. And we might add, so will all philosophies of fear.

SID DOUGLAS.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

MACDONALD AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE

To put those principles into practice and to carry the policy into effect was, above all, the work for which MacDonald had made himself Foreign Secretary, and which the Party looked confidently to him to essay. Few underestimated the difficulties. . . . But for what actually happened no one was prepared. So startling, so devastating it was that even when it came few realised it clearly. Even those who saw could hardly believe. It was tragic to watch men like Brailsford and Morel trying, until further trying was impossible, to persuade themselves that it was not so. Yet, looking back over the year of testing, the truth is pitifully obvious. . . . The reasons for this pitiful surrender are not far to seek. To talk of treachery is absurd. MacDonald was never in his life guilty of so positive and so virile a crime. The plain fact, in plain language, is that he funked the job. . . .

He came to the Foreign Office, he saw, and was conquered. Those skilled dealers with men took his measure swiftly. They praised him to his face and paid seeming deference to his love of authority. Behind his back they smiled and wondered at the anxiety with which they had looked forward to his coming. 'He is the easiest Foreign Secretary I have ever had to manage', was the complacent summing-up of one of the most powerful of them. They flattered him, deluded him, despised him, and, finally, by a shrewd stroke which his foolish confidence in flatteries made easy, brought him crashing to his political ruin.

(From 'The Diplomacy of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald' by 'U.D.C.', *Labour Monthly*, February 1925.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUT 'LM' TO WORK!

STARTING the year with vigour and a balanced sense of priorities, some of our readers have got off to a bright start with ideas translated into action for making the fullest use of *L.M.* Realising that a wider circulation amongst left forces in the labour movement would strengthen their hand in demanding a real socialist programme, a South London reader sent old copies of *L.M.* to every trade union branch in his area, with an introductory letter. This has already produced encouraging results.

After the election, we approached certain constituencies suggesting that the new support and heightened political awareness achieved during the campaign could be further consolidated by introducing *L.M.* to those whose interest had been aroused, to deepen their understanding. Again, some worthwhile results are developing from this suggestion.

A useful bit of initiative was shown by a reader at his trade union branch when he effectively used an article in *L.M.* (and acknowledged the quote!) to strengthen his point in discussion. Following this, two subscriptions have been taken out officially by the Branch.

Finally, a resolution we hope will be multiplied. A Welsh friend, sending a gift and wishing us many new readers in 1965, says 'I intend to really win some myself. I think the time is opportune and the need is urgent'. This is a contribution every friend of *Labour Monthly* can make.

Helen Falber.

£63 14s. 8d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: H.L. (U.S.A.), £5; H. Brindle, 5s; L. Bates (plus Xmas Gift), 10s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 2s; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; J. E. Atkinson (plus Xmas Gift), 11s 1d; D. J. Perry, £1; Southend Branch, 12s 6d; 'Humphreys family', 5s; Ben Ainley, 10s; 'S. Mill', £1; Nellie Usher, 2s 6d; S. Morrissy, 10s; B. W. Mackay, 2s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; G.I., 2s 6d; A. Corbett, £1; Two Tynesiders, 5s 6d; E. Sheldon, 10s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; M. Illing, 10s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; 'Highgate Reader', 19s; L'Humanité (plus extra bonus), 10s; 'The Butcher family', 10s; F.G.A., £1; R.F.B., £3; R. McLeod, 5s; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; J. Tarver, 10s; R. Dodd, £1; Oliver Twist and friends, £1; 'Pax', 5s; Marie Philibert, 10s; M. Brandt, 3s; E.J.B., 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: L. Marlowe, £1 1s; J. H. Jackson, 4s; K. A. Hill, 9s; G. Hunter, 28s; A. C. Spence, 4s; C. H. B. Locke, £1 1s; H. C. Smith, 9s 6d; T.T., £2; A. W. Elliot, 2s 9d; J. P. Mortimore, 9s; K. Stein, 8s; E. Morton, 3s; T. Savage, 4s; J. Morris, 9s; A. Chater, 4s; F. Crump, 4s; G. Pollock, 5s; H. Brandler, 10s; Mrs. A. McMillan, 9s; A. M. Baxter, £1 1s; Mr. and Mrs. Feltham, 9s; R. Owen, 19s; A. W. Hickson, £1 1s; Max Bennett, 19s; W. Chester, 2s 6d; P. J. Wallis, 13s; H.B. (Germany), £1 2s 11d; L. Heywood, 3s; Finchley C.N.D., 6s 5d; 'Fisherman', £2 2s; S. Avyaktanda, 5s; A. Burke, 8s; Mrs. B. Ross, 5s; C. Reid, 10s; W. Arnison, 4s; T. Southern, £1; J. M. Higginton, £1 5s; 'Mugwamp—2', 9s; E. Williams, £1; 'Anon. Scot', £1; T. Crichton, £2; E. M. Berlyn, 7s; R. Herring, 9s 6d; J.A. (Canada), 6s; D. Mukerji, £6 0s 6d.

Our thanks to you all.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

FINchley 5135.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR RESEARCH
'Docks—Whose Inefficiency?'
'The Fight for Comprehensive Schools'
'Mr. Callaghan's New Taxes'
1s. or 1s. 2½d. by post
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London W.C.2

Only a few left . . .
Make sure of your copy

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE DAILY HERALD

R. Palme Dutt Price 6d.

Illustrated with five famous
WILL DYSON CARTOONS

A few copies only are still available of earlier *Labour Monthly* pamphlets.

Order from: 'Pamphlets'
134, Ballards Lane, N.3.

THE HUSSITE MOVEMENT IN BOHEMIA

Josef Macek

Professor Macek tells the story of one of the greatest popular uprisings of the middle ages, which shook feudal Europe to its foundations; the appearance of this book marks the 550th Anniversary of John Fus's death at the stake as a heretic. Appended are translations of Hussite documents and twenty-four pages of photographs.

Paper Covers
7s. 6d.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(*3s. 6d. a line, minimum,* 10*s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly,* 134, *Ballards Lane, London, N.*3.)

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: PRO 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

KENT—RAMSGATE & DISTRICT. For details of properties for sale apply: LESLIE HOGBIN & PARTNERS, 48, Queen Street, Ramsgate. Tel. Thanet 53222.

STILL AVAILABLE. Some early copies of *LM.* These are now becoming rare and prospective buyers are advised to order quickly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Priceless as a living history of this epoch . . .'

(*A. L. Morton*)

Labour Monthly Bound Volume for 1964

Now available to complete your library

Order now:

Through your usual newsagents, price £1 10s. 0d, or send 10s 6d plus 1s 6d postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

LABOUR MONTHLY
134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3.

WHY NOT BY POST?

It's quicker — and it's cheaper too!

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s., Canada and USA, $3.50), for year's subscription from the .....issue.

(SIGNED) ....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED